

Nassau County School District

Bryceville Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Bryceville Elementary School

6504 CHURCH AVE, Bryceville, FL 32009

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 50% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: A (76%) 2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (68%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Bryceville Elementary School

6504 CHURCH AVE, Bryceville, FL 32009

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School KG-5 | Yes | 50% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 8% |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
| Grade | A | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at Bryceville Elementary School is to provide an environment where each student will aspire to be a life-long learner and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Bryceville Elementary School, we are committed to creating an environment that successfully prepares students to achieve academic excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|------------------|--|
| Smith, Tammy | Principal | Coordinates administrative oversight and plans for all phases of instructional leadership for the school including educational programming, administration, budgetary planning, discipline, and counseling services. |
| Sawicki, Elizabeth | Reading Coach | |
| Butler, Sue | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Davis, Latashia | Teacher, K-12 | |
| White, Jessica | School Counselor | |
| Davis, Julie | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Tammy Smith

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

15

Total number of students enrolled at the school

205

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 32 | 33 | 42 | 41 | 30 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 5 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/11/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 32 | 32 | 43 | 40 | 33 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 11 | 15 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 32 | 32 | 43 | 40 | 33 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 7 | 11 | 15 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 71% | 69% | 56% | | | | 84% | 76% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 69% | | | | | | 73% | 65% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 62% | | | | | | 59% | 54% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 80% | 53% | 50% | | | | 87% | 85% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 82% | | | | | | 80% | 77% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 83% | | | | | | 67% | 67% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 84% | 81% | 59% | | | | 74% | 75% | 53% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 87% | 75% | 12% | 58% | 29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 83% | 68% | 15% | 58% | 25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -87% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 75% | 7% | 56% | 26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -83% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 86% | 83% | 3% | 62% | 24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 91% | 81% | 10% | 64% | 27% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -86% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 86% | -4% | 60% | 22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -91% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 73% | 1% | 53% | 21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| WHT | 70 | 70 | 67 | 80 | 83 | 91 | 83 | | | | |
| FRL | 67 | 67 | | 81 | 79 | | | | | | |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 53 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 74 | | 84 | 100 | | 95 | | | | |
| FRL | 66 | | | 76 | | | | | | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 71 | 75 | | 79 | 80 | | 58 | | | | |
| WHT | 84 | 74 | 56 | 89 | 81 | 71 | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 80 | 66 | 55 | 80 | 74 | 64 | 65 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 76 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 531 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 78 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 74 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

It is a trend that Bryceville Elementary School, along with Nassau County elementary schools, consistently perform above the state average.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest area of need is ELA in our primary grades. K-3

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Lack of fidelity using our Saxon phonics program in grades K-2 is a contributing factor to our reading achievement level in grade 3. In addition, students who were in primary grades during the pandemic are still working to close skill gaps.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

While our percentages in 4th and 5th decreased 8% and 1% respectively, our ELA scores are still above the state average. We made significant growth in ELA in our primary grades based on the SAT 10 assessment.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Delivering our saxon phonics curriculum with more fidelity contributed to our increase in ELA scores in our primary grades, this in turn will benefit our upper grades.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Continued progress monitoring to identify skill gaps and help tailor instruction to specific student needs.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Staff development will be provided in BEST standards, the B1G M, various teaching strategies including partner talk, think aloud strategies, cross curricular integration, and writing progression.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Regular meetings with progress monitoring team to ensure students are progressing academically.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Bryceville Elementary School scored 56% achievement proficiency in grade 3 for ELA. Our District average was 64%. This is a decrease of 7% and 4% respectively. This cohort of students who were 1st graders in 19-20 school year are continuing to close skill gaps related to missed instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Student proficiency in ELA 3rd grade BEST Standards as measured by the first and last Progress Monitoring opportunities (PM1/PM3) will increase 37% to 70% proficient.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will utilize regular progress monitoring for all students and more intensive monitoring for at risk students. The progress monitoring team will monitor the at risk students monthly and the leadership team will meet to evaluate progress toward proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence-based strategy used is intentional differentiated ELA instruction based on data from diagnostic assessments, daily observations and Benchmark assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Based on previous FSA and various assessments using iReady, STAR and Benchmark, our data reveals the need for continued adjustments in differentiating small group instruction, providing additional targeted instruction through intervention blocks such as before and after school tutoring.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Targeted in-school support with small group instruction.

Person Responsible

Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Tiered support as indicated in MTSS and supported by progress monitoring team.

Person Responsible

Jessica White (whiteje@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Before and after school tutoring of our lower quartile with targeted instruction based on areas of need.

Person Responsible

Elizabeth Sawicki (sawickiel@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Professional development focused on BEST Standards and the explicit teaching of partner talk, think aloud , and writing strategies.

Person Responsible

Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our current data reveals that we have 25% of students K-5 not attending school at least 90% of the time.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

BES would like to decrease the number of students not attending school at least 90% of the time by 5%.

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student average daily attendance from FOCUS will be reviewed monthly at Threat Assessment Team meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Parent communication will be used to bring awareness of attendance policy and to implement student, classroom and school-wide positive incentives regarding attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

It is evident that parent/student communication and incentives are needed to express the importance of attendance and the correlation to student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. 2-day absenteeism follow-up calls
2. Positive celebrations for students who maintain perfect attendance
3. Increase parent awareness of attendance policy
4. Home visits and parent-teacher conferences regarding poor attendance.
5. Tiered system of support including: letters, phone calls, and building positive relationships.

Person Responsible

Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

School staff, faculty, and administrators strive to strengthen parent involvement in the school. The school will coordinate and integrate parental involvement strategies including community involvement opportunities and business partnerships. School staff, faculty and administrator strive to strengthen family involvement and family empowerment in the school.

The school will provide the coordination, technical assistance, and other support necessary to assist in planning and implementing effective and comprehensive parent involvement programs, based on the National Standards for Parent/Family Involvement Programs, which include:

- A. Communication between home and school is regular, two-way and meaningful.
- B. Responsible parenting is promoted and supported.
- C. Parents play an integral role in assisting students learning. The school will help parents understand the state's academic standards, student progression requirements, and how to monitor their child's progress.
- D. Parents are welcome in school, treated with courtesy and respect, and their support and assistance is sought.
- E. Parents are full partners in the decisions that affect children and families.
- F. Community resources are utilized to strengthen school programs, family practices and student learning.

The school will communicate parental choices and responsibilities to parents. Emphasis will be placed on active parent involvement. The following are examples of family and community involvement communication:

- Open House, Parent Nights
- School Web Page
- FOCUS
- Newsletters communicating classroom and school news to parents
- Parent phone calls, ParentLink, conferences, school marquee, Remind app

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Stakeholder groups include instructional staff and non-instructional staff, students, and families of students, volunteers, Student Advisory Council members and Districts Office personnel. Additional stakeholder groups include after-school care providers, social services, and business partners. Stakeholders groups meet or are consulted to employ school improvements strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment of our schools.